

REMARKS

As a result of the above amendments claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 10 and 14 have been amended and claims 21 and 22 have been added. The above amendments are supported by the original specification, including the figures, and thus do not introduce new matter. Entry of the above amendments and reconsideration of all claims is respectfully requested.

The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the telephone interview of May 19, 2006. During the interview, the Examiner expressed concerns regarding the allowability of the above amended claims 1-20. Again, however, the Applicant respectfully reminds the Examiner that all of the words in a claim, not just some of the words, must be considered when judging the patentability of a claim against the prior art. MPEP 2143.03. Otherwise, the wording of the claim becomes meaningless.

Moreover, the prior art must suggest the desirability of the claimed invention. MPEP 2143.01(I). This requirement prevents the reliance on hindsight reconstruction of the applicant's invention. MPEP 2143.01(I). Here, the prior art fails to make any such suggestion. Instead, the suggestion is made only by the present application.

In the Office Action, the Figures 2c and 2d were objected to for failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(I). Moreover, the drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. In particular, the Examiner has asserted that the hook-and-loop fasteners of claims 2, 12 and 16 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). Accordingly, the Applicant submits a replacement sheet herewith, wherein Figures 2c and 2d have been corrected and the hook-and loop fasteners have been added to Figure 2d. Acceptance of the replace sheet is respectfully requested.

Turning to the claims, claims 1-3, 5, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18 and 20 were objected to as claiming functionally recited subject matter. As a result of the above amendments, Applicant respectfully asserts that these objections have been overcome.

Also in the Office Action, claims 1, 3-11, 13-15 and 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,915,914 to Farrand. Also, claims 11, 15 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Farrand in view of U.S. Patent No. 518,390 to Bever. Further claims 2, 10, 16 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being


unpatentable over Farrand in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,070,741 to Bachman et al.

In response to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 35 U.S.C. 103, Applicant asserts that the claims as now amended overcome the prior art of record. In particular, all of the references relied upon in the rejections fail to pertain, teach or suggest an apparatus or method for supporting picture frame moulding. In view of this failing, Applicant asserts that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that all pending claims be passed to issue. Should the Examiner wish to discuss this further, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (312) 226-1818.

Respectfully Submitted,
FACTOR & LAKE, LTD.

Dated: July 21, 2006


Edward L. Bishop
One of the Attorneys for the Applicants